DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 873 JC 940 574

AUTHOR Lovas, John C.; And Others
TITLE Shared Governance: The Next Generation.
PUB DATE Jul 94
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at "Leadership 2000," the Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program (6th, San Diego, CA, July 17-20, 1994).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Presidents; Community Colleges; *Organizational Change; *Participative Decision Making; *Politics of Education; Power Structure; Teacher Associations; Trustees; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California; *De Anza College CA

ABSTRACT

This document contains three papers which present information from various perspectives on aspects of shared governance at De Anza College, in Cupertino, California. First, "Shared Governance: The Next Generation," by John C. Lovas, provides a brief history of governance in the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, and suggests some of the issues that this history raises for De Anza College. Lovas highlights changes in decision-making processes, resulting increases in faculty participation, and changes in faculty organizations. Next, "Operationalizing Shared Governance in Community Colleges," by Martha J. Kanter, identifies from the perspective of a first-year president the positive and negative aspects of shared governance, and proposes directions for De Anza to pursue in realizing shared governance. Three major points are made: (1) a revisiting of De Anza's mission, (2) communication throughout the college that the need to clarify paths for decision making had top priority, and (3) the identification of groups and individuals that are responsible and accountable of specific areas and decisions. Finally, "Trustee View of Shared Governance," by Jay Jackman, comments on California community colleges' legislative mandate to enhance the role of faculty in college and district governance; highlights national and international examples of failed shared governance; and underscores the importance of mission, integrity, and widespread involvement by the college community. (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 873

Shared Governance: The Next Generation

John C. Lovas
Martha J. Kanter
Jay Jackman, M.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Kanter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at "Leadership 2000," the Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program. (6th, San Diego, CA July 17-20, 1994)

JC 940 574

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

De Anza College

Foothill De Anza Community College District

21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014

SHARED GOVERNANCE: THE NEXT GENERATION

On July 19, 1994, at the Leadership 2000 conference held at the Sheraton Harbor Island Hotel in San Diego, California, the presentation "Shared Governance: The Next Generation" served as a forum for community college leaders to examine the issues of responsibility and authority in decision processes and consider the implications of group responsibility and group authority. The session began with a talk by John C. Lovas, faculty member at De Anza College and co-author of Leadership and Governance published by Jossey-Bass in 1991, followed by a talk by Martha Kanter, President of De Anza College and author of "Instructional Programs" in Managing Community Colleges (Cohen & Brawer, Jossey-Bass, 1994) and "Accountability through Assessment" in Community Colleges in Making a Difference (T.W. Banta, Jossey-Bass, 1993). The forum concluded with remarks by De Anza College Trustee, Dr. Jay Jackman. Presentation material from the three-part forum is included herein. The authors may be contacted at De Anza College, 21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Cupertino, CA 95014 or by email: kanter@admin.fhda.edu or lovas@admin.fhda.edu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: Shared Governance:
The Next Generation.....John C. Lovas

Part II: Operationalizing Shared
Governance in Community
Colleges.....Martha J. Kanter

Part III: Trustee View of
Shared Governance.....Jay Jackman, M.D.

Part I: Shared Governance: The Next Generation

by
John C. Lovas
De Anza College

What Jay Jackman, Martha Kanter, and I hope to do is both quite modest and quite ambitious. We simply want to describe a significant transition in our institution, one that will test the efficacy of the existing governance structure. In making this modest effort, we hope to raise critical questions and identify key issues in governance that we believe most community colleges face. We are not so bold to suggest we have the answers to those questions.

De Anza College, as part of the Foothill-De Anza district, has been engaged in consciously planned forms of shared governance since 1981, well before the passage of AB 1725 in California. While I have been a faculty member at De Anza since 1977 (and, before that, a faculty member at Foothill starting in 1965), Martha joined De Anza last August 1 and Jay was elected to the board last November. In one way or another, I have been associated with every development in governance in the Foothill-De Anza district since 1965. Martha and Jay have spent the last year learning about that governance system, assessing its strengths and weaknesses, and considering how to adapt it and adapt to it, as we face the leadership challenge of reinventing the college for the next century.

My role is primarily that of contextualizer. I will sketch a brief history of governance at Foothill-De Anza, a history that, I believe, very much recapitulates most elements of governance in the state. Then I will suggest some of the issues this history raises for De Anza. In that context, Martha

will offer the perspective of a first-year president, suggesting what De Anza's governance system needs to be if the college is to continue as a first-rank institution. Jay will comment on both of our presentations from the perspective of a new board member who, with four other members all in their first terms as board members, will take this district into its next generation.

How has governance changed at Foothill-De Anza over the past 30 years? Let me give two personal examples to suggest the change in decision structures over that period. When I came to Foothill in 1965, I was given a schedule to teach. No one asked which courses I would like to teach. No one asked when I would like to teach those courses. The schedule was constructed by the Division Chair and submitted to the Dean of Instruction for approval. One of the Dean's criteria was that the schedule should be spread out so that I had to spend at least 5 days and 30 hours per week on campus. For this fall, I described to the assistant *department* chair both the courses and the times I wanted, the department chair reviewed it, and that's the schedule I will have. The *assistant* division chair actually inputs the schedule, working with staff in Administrative Services. No dean or vice-president looks at individual schedules routinely, though the overall schedule is analyzed for balance and enrollment management.

In February, 1965, Hu Semans (who died just this past May) interviewed me in the Placement Office of the University of Utah for 28 minutes. He introduced me to Cal Flint, who spoke with me less than two minutes. Based only on that direct contact, my application, and transcripts, Cal Flint called me in March, 1965, to offer me a teaching position. A few years ago, I served on a six-member hiring committee, consisting of four faculty members (one the department chair), the division dean, and a

classified staff member who served as affirmative action representative. We screened 180 applications for three faculty positions in English, interviewed about 20 of those applicants, reducing them to five finalists. Only then did the vice-president join our committee for a round of interviews with the finalists. We jointly agreed upon the three candidates who would be sent to the president for interviews and for recommendation to the Board of Trustees. All three were hired and are now tenured by a process conducted almost entirely by faculty (and reviewed by appropriate administrators). The screening and interviewing process covered a period of over four months. I could cite similar changes in the way decisions are made about curriculum, about evaluation, and departmental budget expenditures.

In short, decision processes have changed substantially over the past 30 years and, generally, those processes have significantly more faculty participation. Are the results of the decisions better? Are the costs of the decisions justifiable? Because of the changes, we can now ask these questions, though again I'm not sure we have a clear idea of how best to seek answers.

Our history of faculty organizations also illustrates the kinds of decision structure changes we have undergone. When I came to Foothill in 1965, there was one faculty organization, the Foothill College Faculty Association, whose elected leaders also doubled as the officers of the chapter of the California Teachers Association. The most common metaphor for relations among staff was the "family." But I arrived amidst a hiring frenzy (42 full-time hires) and sheer numbers stretched the credulity of the family analogy. During my first year, Foothill created an Academic Senate; the following year, an AFT local was established. The following year, De Anza opened and established both a Senate and a Faculty Association. In 1970, the AFT local invoked the Winton Act, creating a Certificated Employees Council

to meet and confer with the Board. In 1972, the Faculty Association for Continuing Education formed, representing part-time faculty. By 1973, the CEC represented five faculty organizations, not counting the two senates. Then, in 1976, under the provisions of SB 160, the faculties of the two colleges voted for an independent bargaining agent, the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association. Similar developments of representative organizations occurred among classified staff. So if 1958-65 was the family era, then 1965 to 1980 was the employee organizing era. The term "shared governance" came into being only after faculty and staff had formally established themselves as legal entities to be negotiated with. Thus, our various governance experiments throughout the 80's came in the context that everyone was at the table. Now the discussions were about the size and shape of the table, about establishing norms for table manners, and agreeing that no business would be done under the table. In 1982, the leaders of various district groups were asked, "Is there a problem with a sense of powerlessness and or meaningless participation of the part of Foothill-De Anza people?" 78% answered "yes." In response, both district and college structures were created that had representatives of all groups reviewing all policy proposals and all major (and many minor) budget decisions before they went to the Board of Trustees. If "shared" meant participating, then we did quite a good job. The process even led sub-groups of employees to organize in new ways and ask for a place at the table (e.g., Division Deans and the Minority Staff Association). One joke that went around the state in the mid-80's claimed that Foothill-De Anza was where everyone gathered in the gym to put the budget together.

But having everyone at the table didn't keep us from an $11 million dollar error that sent shock waves throughout the colleges and precipitated a complete turnover in top leadership in less than four years (the entire board,

the chancellor, and both college presidents, as well as several deans and a vice-president). This rapid change has led us to ask what I think of as the next generation of questions for shared governance.

Let me suggest some of those questions. Who really needs to be at the policy-recommending table? What qualifies a person to serve at the policy-recommending table? What matters need not come to that policy-recommending body? Can we understand that decision-making is shared if a department develops a recommendation, a division shapes it, a dean's council reviews it, a college-wide council recommends it, and a president seeks board approval--even though not every constituency is present at each critical stage of the decision? What are the appropriate relationships between bargaining agent organizations, specific interest group organizations (Asian-American faculty; Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual faculty), and departmental, divisional and college work units and committees? What new channels, modes and styles of communicating are needed to maintain a sense of "shared decision-making"? What concepts of authority and responsibility make sense in an increasingly decentralized, increasingly collaborative, increasingly technological organizational environment? [For instance, I believe computer technicians have more impact on organizational decisions than their numbers or their status would suggest.]

This last question, focusing on "authority "and "responsibility," asks whether our traditional views of those concepts are really helpful in the forms of collaboration that are developing in our colleges.

First of all, the larger culture seems to be reexamining or redefining traditional notions of authority and responsibility. Major societal institutions, such as the church, the government, and the press, no longer enjoy authority of office. Ordinary parishioners, citizens, and reader/viewers

quite readily question and challenge the proposals and opinions of leaders. Though educators, especially in higher education, probably still get broader acknowledgement of the authority of office (most students still won't challenge professors), I suspect educators will soon join their colleagues in other institutions in being asked tough questions and met with skepticism when answers appear uninformed or unresponsive. Though many see this transformation of our notions of authority as evidence of the decay and corruption of our society, I prefer to see it as a slow, but inexorable shift to shared power, where the authority of competence and insight and wisdom and compassion counts for more than the authority of office. Does this distinction correlate with the usual distinction between "authoritative" and "authoritarian"?

A bit of linguistic analysis may help here. "Authority" has subtle relationships to "author" [as a noun], "author" [as a verb], "authorship," "authoritarian," and "authoritative." In organizational contexts, where individuals of varying backgrounds and competencies meet in groups to make decisions and to recommend policy, with what "authority" does a participant speak or act? I find it useful to consider the forms of "authority" shared by everyone in the organization, contrasted with those forms particular to individuals or groups within the organization. Every person in the organization is a human being, each with a unique set of experiences, a personal history of which each of us is the world's authority. At the same time, each of us is an organization member, the fact which establishes our relationship to one another.

On the other hand, some forms of authority are more particular, such as those defined in law relating to boards, unions, senates. Some authority is contractural, based on negotiated agreements. Some authority is political,

both through formally established entities and processes and through informal networks of influence and lobbying. Some authority is based on knowledge, which may be technical or experiential or based on longevity, i.e., lived organizational history. For me, shared governance requires careful consideration of these differing kinds of authority, arranging structures and processes to ensure the most authoritative members of the organization participate in the decisions appropriate to their authority. This notion is relatively easy to conceptualize, but quite difficult to operationalize. I think it's the major reason that "shared decision-making" seems so ponderous, so time-consuming, and sometimes quite ineffective. The problem lies not in the notion of "sharing," but in the particular authorities of those doing the sharing. To illustrate: if a decision about accounting procedures is taken by a group most of whom do not understand basic accounting, the decision may be flawed or unnecessarily delayed. If most divisions send relatively new and inexperienced faculty to serve on the curriculum committee, much of the time may be spent educating members rather than getting work done.

Other issues arise out of this consideration of "authority" and its related concepts. Academics have long established traditions of individual authorship, of attributing ideas and language to individual creators. In shared decision-making, what happens to the concept of being an author of an idea, of authoring a proposal? Should authorship be applied to the product of a collaboration where shared decision-making and idea integration have marked the process? Is it important and useful to distinguish between group authorship and individual authors?

In the light of these concepts and questions, let me offer some tentative thoughts about important features of any effective shared decision process:

- The process should strive to be authoritative and anti-authoritarian.

• The process should seek to understand and explicitly recognize the differing kinds of authority among participants.

• The process should encourage that decisions to act occur closest to where the greatest authority for that action exists in the organization.

• The process redefines "authorship," establishing an ethic and a practice that ideas are not credited and owned by individuals in a collaboration.

• The process demands creating new ways of acknowledging individual participation and contribution to the outcomes and products of shared decisions and organizational collaborations.

Though time limits my ability to explore "responsibility" in the same detail I have treated "authority," I think this concept needs at least as much attention. Jay Jackman likes to suggest the term implies both "response" and "ability." Certainly, the concept of "response" needs to be explored in both decision-making and communicating around decisions. Community colleges have rightly been considered the most responsive segment of higher education. Can we be sure that responsiveness reflects responsibility? Our responsiveness usually applies to the relationship the college has to its community. Do we have the same quality of responsiveness to the students and staff of the college?

Much of the difficulty in shared-decision contexts lies with the lack of response from constituencies or from skewed responses that do not accurately reflect the intensity and range of opinion in the college. Is it useful to distinguish between the "unresponsive" members of the organization and the "irresponsible" members? Can shared decision processes create consequences for both the unresponsive and the irresponsible? What would those processes look like?

Finally, any form of shared decision making depends heavily on effective organizational communication. Good shared governance requires much more communicating down and communicating across the organizational structure. Do we know what those communication structures should look like? Do organization members feel responsible for such communication? Our knowledge of this area seems significantly less than our knowledge of strategic planning and budget development procedures. In communicty colleges, we regularly assess our financial condition with audits and increasingly colleges conduct various forms of management audits. We also are used to evaluating curriculum and teaching. How many colleges do you know that have a communication audit? Without such assessments, how do we know that decisions are reaching those affected? We all know that a message sent does not mean a message received. When messages are blocked or distorted in a shared governance context, how does one identify where messages are stopping or who is reshaping messages to be other than what the sender meant? This is an area of organziational knowledge that requires considerable study and development. Learning to troubleshoot organizational communication systems may be critical to any effective organizational development that relies heavily on shared decision-making processes and structures.

With that bit of context, here's Martha Kanter to address these issues based on her first year as De Anza president.

Part II: Operationalizing Shared Governance in Community Colleges

by Martha J. Kanter

IN 1994, 6 YEARS AFTER AB 1725 WAS CHAPTERED INTO THE STATE'S EDUCATION CODE, WE ARE NOW ASKING OURSELVES THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1) HOW IS "SHARED GOVERNANCE" IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES BEING OPERATIONALIZED IN LIGHT OF THE WAYS IN WHICH IT WAS ENVISIONED IN AB 3409 AND AB 1725?

2) WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF PARTICIPATION OF CONSTITUENTS AND OF THOSE MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT VARIOUS GOVERNANCE ISSUES?

3) WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES? WHAT DOES ACCOUNTABILITY MEAN? WHAT IS REQUIRED VERSUS WHAT IS PERMISSIVE?

4) WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED IN THE SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS?

WE MIGHT HAVE CALLED THIS SESSION: QUESTIONS OF CONFIDENCE - QUESTIONS OF TRUST. HERE ARE SOME QUOTATIONS THAT CAPTURE THE SHARED GOVERNANCE DILEMMA WE NOW FACE IS:

"BLESSED ARE THE FLEXIBLE
FOR THEY SHALT NOT BE
BENT OUT OF SHAPE!"

IMPLEMENTING SHARED GOVERNANCE REQUIRES THE FLEXIBILITY OF ALL PARTICIPANTS AS WE LEARN TO WORK WITH ONE ANOTHER IN NEW WAYS!

"IF YOU WOULD ONLY STOP BARKING
LONG ENOUGH SO I COULD
TELL YOU WHAT I MEAN"

SHARED GOVERNANCE REQUIRES US TO TAKE THE TIME TO LISTEN TO ONE ANOTHER FROM AN INSTITUTIONAL, AS OPPOSED TO A CONSTITUENCY PERSPECTIVE

THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS, KNOWN AS ACCCA, RECENTLY COMPLETED A SURVEY OF 460 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS. HERE IS WHAT THEY SAID:

POSITIVE COMMENTS

"THE COMPLEXITY OF SHARED GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHERS TO ADAPT (E.G., TO BE "MORE PERSUASIVE" OR "COLLABORATIVE" AND TO BECOME LONG-RANGE PLANNERS INSTEAD OF SHORT-TERM DECISION-MAKERS" (26 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS IMPROVED GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING THROUGH GREATER PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION, ETC., WITH NEGLIGIBLE DISADVANTAGES" (35 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS NOT AFFECTED THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (OF ADMINISTRATORS) BECAUSE THE RESPONDENT OR THE INSTITUTION WAS ALREADY OPERATING WITHIN A "PARTICIPATORY, GROUND-UP MODEL OF DECISION-MAKING" (10 COMMENTS)

"INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS ARE GOING THROUGH TRANSITIONS WHICH WILL TAKE THEM BEYOND THEIR INITIAL NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES WITH SHARED GOVERNANCE TO POSITIVE OUTCOMES AS THEY GAIN ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROCESS" (9 COMMENTS)

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

"SHARED GOVERNANCE UNDER AB 1725 IS SLOW, TEDIOUS, TIME-CONSUMING AND WASTEFUL (I.E., BUREAUCRATIC) (75 COMMENTS)

"MORE TIME IMPLEMENTING THE SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS RESULTS IN GREATER DIFFICULTY FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN IMPLEMENTING NEW PROGRAMS AND OTHERWISE MEETING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES" (57 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS RESULTED IN CHAOS, CONFUSION, STALEMATE AND THE INABILITY TO MAKE DECISIONS AND RESPOND TO SITUATIONS IN A TIMELY MANNER" (25 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS INCREASED ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSIBILITIES WHILE WEAKENING THEIR AUTHORITY, WHEREAS IT HAS INCREASED THE AUTHORITY OF FACULTY (AND CLASSIFIED STAFF) WITHOUT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THEIR DECISIONS OR PRACTICES" (54 COMMENTS)

"THE MYTH OF SHARED GOVERNANCE UNDER AB 1725 DISGUISES THE SELF-SERVING AGENDAS AND POLITICAL MANEUVERING (USUALLY OF FACULTY) WHICH UNDERMINE TRUE COLLEGIALITY, EFFICIENT DECISION MAKING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS" (21 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS LED TO POLARIZATION AND ADVERSARIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN FACULTY, CLASSIFIED STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS" (11 COMMENTS)

"AB 1725 HAS RESULTED IN AN UNFAVORABLE AMOUNT OF POWER, CONTROL AND ADVANTAGE TO FACULTY" (32 COMMENTS)

"FRONT-LINE, MIDDLE-LEVEL MANAGEMENT ARE BY-PASSED OR UNDERMINED BY SHARED GOVERNANCE UNDER AB 1725 WHICH PUTS THEM AT A DISADVANTAGE, ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE FACULTY WITH WHOM THEY MUST WORK" (30 COMMENTS)

IMPACTS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

GIVEN THE PROS AND CONS ARTICULATED, THIS COMMENT SUMS UP THE DISCUSSION:

"SHARED GOVERNANCE IS A GOOD CONCEPT IN THE ABSTRACT BUT CLEAR DEFINITION OF ITS PARAMETERS, CLEAR INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTIONS, AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR CONSTITUENCY REPRESENTATIVES ARE REQUIRED IF IT IS TO BE IMPLEMENTED WITH POSITIVE RESULTS" (34 COMMENTS)

THERE IS A CRITICAL NEED NOW FOR US TO DETERMINE AND CLARIFY:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT?

WHO IS ACCOUNTABLE FOR WHAT?

THE CONFUSION BETWEEN "GROUP AUTHORITY", "INDIVIDUAL AUTHORITY", AND ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY MUST BE ADDRESSED. MANY OF US IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE INCREASED CONCERN ABOUT ACCOUNTABILITY IN CARRYING OUT DECISIONS COMES AT A TIME WHEN PROFESSIONAL AND JOB SECURITY IS REDUCED.

EXAMPLES INCLUDE: REDUCED ADMINISTRATIVE APPLICANTS FOR AVAILABLE JOBS, NO TENURE FOR ADMINISTRATORS ANYMORE, MORE DIFFICULT CONDITIONS FOR DECISION-MAKING

HERE ARE SOME ACTIONS THAT ARE PLANNED FOR THE 1994-95 ACADEMIC YEAR FROM VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES THAT MAKE UP THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES:

CHANCELLOR/PRESIDENTS: THE CEOS PLAN TO REVISIT SHARED GOVERNANCE AND THE INTENT OF AB 1725 (CEO AGENDA)

FACULTY: FACCC WILL REVISIT SHARED GOVERNANCE (CONCERN: EVEN ON THOSE CAMPUSES CHARACTERIZED AS DOING WELL, THERE WAS EVIDENCE OF STEREOTYPING AND PERSONALITY CONFLICTS WHICH TEND TO HINDER PROGRESS) (CALIFORNIANS 5/26/94 MINUTES) - QUESTION THEY ASK: IS SHARED GOVERNANCE HAVING AN EFFECT IN TERMS OF HIGHER QUALITY AND BETTER DECISIONS?

STUDENTS: CALSACC TO REVISIT SHARED GOVERNANCE BECAUSE OF SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS RE: STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS (CALIFORNIANS 5/26/94 MINUTES)

THESE GROUPS ADDRESS THE NEED TO REDEFINE ROLES AND SAY THAT IN MANY CASES, SHARED GOVERNANCE RESPONSIBILITIES WERE SHIFTED TO CONSTITUENT GROUPS, OFTEN WITHOUT THE ATTENDANT DECISION STRUCTURE IN PLACE.

DE ANZA'S EFFORT - ISSUES FOR A NEW CEO

AS THE NEW PRESIDENT OF DE ANZA COLLEGE, HERE ARE SOME DIRECTIONS I BELIEVE THAT DE ANZA WILL NEED TO PURSUE TO REALIZE SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE FUTURE.

- **WE NEED TO REVISIT DE ANZA'S MISSION, DEVELOP A MISSION-BASED STRATEGIC PLAN AND A DECISION-MAKING MODEL (GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE).**

- **WE MUST COMMUNICATE THROUGHOUT THE INSTITUTION THAT THE NEED TO CLARIFY PATHS FOR DECISION-MAKING IS ONE OF THE TOP 10 PRIORITIES RESULTING FROM OUR STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORT.**

- **WE NEED TO IDENTIFY WHAT GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS ARE RESPONSIBLE AND ACCOUNTABLE FOR WHICH ARENAS, FOR WHAT DECISIONS.**

- **OUR COLLEGE MUST CONSCIOUSLY AND PUBLICLY DEVELOP THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE FOR DECISION-MAKING THROUGH THE FOLLOWING AVENUES:**
    - **GIVE CLEAR CHARGES TO COMMITTEES TO CLARIFY SCOPE**
    - **DEVELOP STRUCTURAL CHARTS SO SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESSES ARE UNDERSTOOD**
    - **CONDUCT ONGOING PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES**
    - **HOLD OPEN DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE ISSUE OF TRUST (E.G., APPOINTMENTS TO COLLEGE COUNCIL, ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES COMMITTEE, ETC.)**

WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT AND CHOOSE THE "MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE" INDIVIDUALS TO SERVE ON GOVERNANCE GROUPS (E.G., BUDGET, PLANNING, PROGRAM REVIEW, ETC.)

NEXT STEPS AT DE ANZA

- **REVISIT COLLEGE/DISTRICT SHARED GOVERNANCE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**
- **DEFINE WHAT IT MEANS TO DELEGATE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY**
- **DIRECTLY ADDRESS THE DECISION STRUCTURE FOR THE RESPONSIBILITIES IDENTIFIED**
- **PROVIDE TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR EACH COMMITTEE, DEPENDING UPON THE SCOPE OF THE COMMITTEE**
- **FOCUS ON COMMUNICATION**
- **BUILD INTO THE CHARGES THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR OUTCOMES**
- **HELP INDIVIDUALS DEVELOP A BROADER VIEW OF THE INSTITUTION RATHER THAN A SECTARIAN OR CONSTITUENT VIEW**

APPENDIX TO PART 2: Operationalizing Shared Governance in Community Colleges

"SHARED GOVERNANCE IN-ACTION?" BY MARTHA J. KANTER IS FOUND IN THE BOOK MANAGING COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A HANDBOOK FOR EFFECTIVE PRACTICE (EDS. ARTHUR M. COHEN AND FLORENCE B. BRAWER, PAGES 228-230) PUBLISHED IN 1994 BY JOSSEY-BASS PUBLISHERS, SAN FRANCISCO.

SHARED GOVERNANCE IN-ACTION?

DESPITE A COMPELLING MISSION, COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGIC PLAN, BALANCED CURRICULUM, AND AN IDEALLY SUITED FACULTY, THE COLLEGE MAY STILL BE IN CRISIS. BREAKDOWNS MAY OCCUR WHEN AN ATTEMPT IS MADE TO PUT IDEAS INTO PRACTICE. WHAT CREATES AN ENVIRONMENT CONDUCIVE TO MANAGING A HEALTHY INSTITUTION? THE ANSWER, PERHAPS, LIES IN THE GOVERNANCE OF AN INSTITUTION. ANY DISCUSSION OF GOVERNANCE REQUIRES AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY, THE COMPANION TO GOVERNANCE, AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TAKEN TO REALIZE AN ACTION. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY ARE, OF COURSE, *TWO HORNS ON THE SAME GOAT*, AS CHARACTERIZED BY ZORBA THE GREEK.

THE NEXT QUESTION WE MUST ASK, THEN, IS: WHO ARE THE PARTIES WHO MUST ENGAGE IN A PROCESS WHICH WILL BE PRINCIPALLY GOVERNED BY THE TERMS *AUTHORITY* AND *RESPONSIBILITY* AND, PERHAPS MOST IMPORTANTLY, WHAT DO THEY UNDERSTAND THESE TERMS TO MEAN? FORMERLY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES, GOVERNANCE HAPPENED MOST OFTEN IN A TOP-DOWN, AUTOCRATIC, AND SOMETIMES MILITARISTIC STYLE. AS THE PRESIDENT WENT, SO WENT THE INSTITUTION AND ALL ITS PARTS. IN RECENT YEARS, FACULTY HAVE CALLED UPON INSTITUTIONS TO RECOGNIZE FACULTY EXPERTISE AND TO, IN FACT, DELEGATE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN A MORE FORMAL WAY FOR CARRYING OUT FUNCTIONS WHICH ARE ACADEMIC IN NATURE (FOR EXAMPLE, CURRICULUM MATTERS, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES, STAFF DEVELOPMENT).

FOLLOWING THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO MASTER PLANS FOR CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION (1960 AND 1986), COMMUNITY COLLEGES ATTEMPTED TO MOVE TOWARD A YESHIVA MODEL OF GOVERNANCE, INTRODUCING COLLEGIALITY INTO THE FORMAL GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF THE INSTITUTIONS (CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1990; CLARK, 1981; KAPLIN, 1985, PP. 107-118; LEE, 1980-1981; *NLRB V. YESHIVA UNIVERSITY*, 1978, 1980). CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES' USE OF THE TERM *SHARED GOVERNANCE* CAME INTO VOGUE IN 1988 FOLLOWING THE PASSAGE OF REFORM LEGISLATION (ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1725; CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1990).

SHARED GOVERNANCE SIMPLY MEANS COLLEGIAL DECISION-MAKING. WHAT WAS MEANT TO BE, IN FACT, COLLEGIAL DECISION-MAKING AND THE CONCOMITANT EMPOWERMENT OF THE FACULTY,

SOON BECAME AN ADVERSARIAL BATTLE FOR POWER. IN SOME COLLEGES, FACULTY WANTED THE COMPLETE AND FINAL SAY OVER SUCH INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES AS BUDGETING AND ACCREDITATION. THE INTENT OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATION WAS TO RAISE THE STANDARDS OF FACULTY EXPERTISE AND TO PROMOTE A SHARING OF PERSPECTIVES IN MAKING ACADEMIC DECISIONS ON BEHALF OF STUDENTS. ADMINISTRATORS WERE TO WORK IN HARMONY WITH FACULTY AND STAFF TO BRING DIVERSE VIEWS TO ISSUES WHICH WOULD, IN TURN, ALLOW CREATIVE ALTERNATIVES TO COME FORTH FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO DECISION-MAKING (CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1990; YOUNG, J., 1988). UNFORTUNATELY, THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE DEMONSTRATES ONCE AGAIN THAT WHEN BEHAVIOR IS LEGISLATED, SIDES FORM AND ISSUES BECOME POLARIZED, AND OFTEN MUCH MORE COMPLICATED THAN THEY WERE ORIGINALLY ENVISIONED.

THE TAO SAYS SIMPLY: "THE FEWER RULES THE BETTER. RULES REDUCE FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY. ENFORCEMENT OF RULES IS COERCIVE AND MANIPULATIVE, WHICH DIMINISHES SPONTANEITY AND ABSORBS GROUP ENERGY. THE MORE COERCIVE YOU ARE, THE MORE RESISTANT THE GROUP WILL BECOME. YOUR MANIPULATIONS WILL ONLY BREED EVASIONS. EVERY LAW CREATES AN OUTLAW...WHEN THE LEADER PRACTICES SILENCE, THE GROUP REMAINS FOCUSED. WHEN THE LEADER DOES NOT IMPOSE RULES, THE GROUP DISCOVERS ITS OWN GOODNESS. WHEN THE LEADER ACTS UNSELFISHLY, THE GROUP SIMPLY DOES WHAT IS TO BE DONE." (HEIDER, 1985, P. 113)

WHETHER GOVERNANCE CAN TRULY BE SHARED IS YET TO BE SEEN (YOUNG, 1988). MOST CONVERSATIONS ABOUT SHARED GOVERNANCE CONTINUE TO CENTER AROUND WHETHER FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS HAVE INDEED BEEN EMPOWERED IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, OR WHETHER FACULTY AND STAFF VIEW SHARED GOVERNANCE AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEIZE POWER FROM THE ADMINISTRATION. SOME ADMINISTRATORS ON THE OTHER HAND REGARD SHARED GOVERNANCE AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO HANG ON TO POWER THEY NEVER REALLY HAD IN THE FIRST PLACE.

IF THE PARTIES ARE UNCLEAR ABOUT WHO IS DOING WHAT, AND SIMILARLY, WHO HAS RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY FOR THE DECISIONS THAT MUST BE MADE WITHIN A SHARED GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK, INSTRUCTIONAL DECISION-MAKING CAN BECOME A NIGHTMARE. FOR EXAMPLE, AT MOST COMMUNITY COLLEGES, RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPING COURSES AND PROGRAMS RESTS WITH THE FACULTY. CURRICULUM COMMITTEES ARE MOST OFTEN COMPRISED OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS WHO OVERSEE WHAT AND HOW COURSES ARE TAUGHT. SIMILARLY, ADMINISTRATORS MOST OFTEN HAVE THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO ASSIGN FACULTY TO TEACH PARTICULAR COURSES, TO SCHEDULE COURSES, AND TO OVERSEE PROGRAM REVIEW, IN SHORT, TO MANAGE THE ASPECTS OF THE CURRICULUM AS A WHOLE SO THE INSTITUTION CAN MAXIMIZE ITS RESOURCES.

THE INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE, THEN, IS FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY BOTH - SEPARATELY AND THEN TOGETHER - TO IDENTIFY

SPECIFIC AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY BEFORE DECISIONS ARE MADE AND ACTIONS TAKEN. WHO HAS THE *RESPONSIBILITY*? WHO HAS THE *AUTHORITY*? TO FACILITATE AN ORDERLY COLLEGE, INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS MUST WORK COLLEGIALLY WITH THE ACADEMIC SENATE, THE CLASSIFIED STAFF, STUDENTS, AND THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENTS IN AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE THE SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY OF EACH OF THE CONSTITUENT GROUPS IS CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD BY THE STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INSTITUTION.

Part III: Trustee View of Shared Governance

by Jay Jackman, M.D.

Shared governance is both an opportunity and a risk. It is about power, decision-making, authority and responsibility. For a moment, let me compare the U.S. Constitution with AB 1725. The Constitution was framed for and by landed white males over the age of 21. Initially, the Constitution did not include Blacks, women, or people under the age of 21 in the election of senators for this country. Gradually, all of this changed.

AB1725 was designed to enhance the role of faculty in college and district governance. Neither classified staff nor students were included as participants in the original drafts of shared governance legislation.

Let us not be fooled into believing that there are no serious risks in implementing shared governance. Internationally, nationally, and locally we experience some of the risks associated with shared governance in various arenas. Examples include:

- International arena--Algerian election, Bosnia, Eastern Europe, Africa.
- National arena--failure of Congress to deal with crime, education, health.
- Local arena--Unwillingness to tax ourselves for public education (schools).
- Other arenas--State of origin and religious right.

Shared governance truly means shared responsibility and authority but not necessarily equally shared power or decision-making. (Dr. Jackman then gave a shared governance example of a district financial problem).

For shared governance to work, there must be training. Organizations such as CFIER (California Foundation for Improvement of Employer/Employee Relations) point out that for shared governance to work, there must be a focus on finding shared interests (not positions). This can be a very difficult thing to do.

Here are some important points to consider:

1. District and college missions should be central. But what happens in hard financial times when the mission may conflict with job security or pet beliefs?
2. Shared governance requires that everyone have integrity in dealing with other groups, which is hard when there are conflicting loyalties as we often find in the collegial environment.
3. For the system to work, everyone must be involved and most are not (we see the lack of involvement in our failure to convince voters to approve most of the recent state and local bond elections).
4. People must begin to act like the citizens of the old Greek city-states. Being politically involved was expected; it was the norm, and you were not a citizen if you were not involved!

For me, shared governance is really about the future of our democratic system, not just our community colleges. It is a paradise for political involvement at all levels, but the risk of it being narrowly based as with the religious right is not to be underestimated.

Shared governance is hard work but is far more likely to produce the results we want if we can get it to work.

We all know that the old top down style of governance, while it may maintain power as it was, will not produce the results we want in a rapidly changing society.